

CITY ITEMS.

RANGE OF THE THERMOMETER AT
A. J. Palmer's, (formerly Lynch & Co.) 25 1/2 Wall st.
 1852. 6 A.M. Noon 3 P.M. 6 P.M.
 July 1. 75 75 77 75

AMUSEMENTS, AT THIS DAY AND EVENING.

Edwin Forrest—French Comedians, &c.
Edwin Forrest—French Comedians, &c.
Edwin Forrest—French Comedians, &c.
Edwin Forrest—French Comedians, &c.

The weather, yesterday, was rather
 more warm than comfortable. The night was very
 sultry until about 11 o'clock, when a slight breeze pro-
 duced a cooler feeling.

OPENING OF THE NEW-JERSEY
CENTRAL RAILROAD.—The Directors of the New Jersey
 Central Railroad Company intend opening their road
 this morning, and have invited their friends to assist in the
 ceremonies at Easton, Pa.

"Z" ought to know that we never
 publish anonymous communications. He ought also to
 know that his demand for names is absurd, spurious,
 and intended to subvert personal and not public an-
 nals. If he can throw any light upon "Rowdism," we shall
 be glad to receive it, upon a responsible name and ad-
 dress.

ARRIVAL OF THE DOLPHIN.—The U. S.
 Brigantine Dolphin, S. P. Lee, Lieut. Commanding, from
 a general cruise and 50 days from Pernambuco, arrived
 Thursday morning.

Officers—S. P. Lee, Lieut. Commanding; J. P. Hall,
Master; J. D. Davis, Surgeon; W. H. Mayo, Passed Mid-
shipman; J. C. Elliot, Captain's Clerk.

The Dolphin has returned from a surveying cruise,
 made under the direction of Bureau of Hydrography of
 the Navy Department. She has sounded the depths of
 the Ocean varying from one to four miles, and made
 daily observations of the currents and temperatures both
 superficial and submarine. The deep sea soundings
 were taken by means of a small, strong line with a 35-
 pound shot attached, and let run from a boat, which
 was kept directly over the shot by gentle motion of the
 coils. The deepest cast when bottom was obtained was
 7,500 fathoms, or about 4 1/2 miles. The currents were
 observed at the surface and at the depth of 10 and 50
 fathoms, and the temperature at various depths from
 the surface to 500 fathoms.

The Dolphin was commissioned in June 1851, since
 which time she has been constantly at sea, with the ex-
 ception of some days spent in the ports of Port-au-Prince,
 Pernambuco, Fernando de Noronha and Para. She has
 carefully examined the reported positions of a num-
 ber of islands, rocks and shoals, which lay in her track
 and ascertained their true position. She has also made
 a survey accurately, defined the position of the
 rocks, rocky reefs, lying between Fernando de Noronha
 and the main land of South America. Great atten-
 tion has been paid to the Equatorial, St. Roque and
 Amazon currents, and the submarine volcanic region
 south of the Equator has been thoroughly explored.

The Dolphin has also made a complete set of meteor-
 ological observations.

We presume that the results of this cruise will be
 published by the Bureau of Hydrography. These in-
 vestigations have been made in connection with the
 wind and current charts of Lieut. Maury, which have
 already been of great service to the commerce of the
 country, and we hope that they will prove of great
 utility to those reported dangers and obstructions to
 navigation, so many of which disfigure the charts of the
 North Atlantic, in the direction of the Azores, be
 thoroughly examined and reported upon.

COLLISION.—The Fulton ferry boat Bedford
 came into collision with a brig lying in the channel
 of the East River about one o'clock yesterday morning,
 and was much injured. The side of the gentleman's
 cabin was crushed in. The bowsprit of the brig was
 damaged, but, we believe, she received no other injury
 of importance.

THE NEW STEAMER CORTEX went down
 the Bay yesterday, on a trial trip.

NEW-YORK STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY.
 On Wednesday Prof. Spencer read an interesting
 paper upon Vital Chemistry, or Animal Heat. Dr. J. R.
 Wood introduced a patient who had been cured of a
 rupture of the bladder, a very remarkable case. Dr.
 Cady's resolution on quackery was ruled out of order.
 In the afternoon, the members of the Society visited
 the Blind Institution, and thence went to Dr. Mott's at
 Bloomingdale, to make a social call.

Yesterday, the President (Prof. Clark) read an elab-
 orate and interesting paper on "The Pathology of Pneu-
 monia." In the afternoon the members visited several
 of the institutions under charge of the Ten Governors,
 and spent the evening with Prof. Stephens, at Astoria.

Today there will be a paper from Harvey L. Peet,
 L.D., the President of the Deaf and Dumb Institu-
 tion, on the Medical Peculiarities attending the Deaf
 and Dumb. We understand that the paper is one of
 high merit, and there will be no doubt be a large attendance
 of scientific and professional men to hear it. It
 will be read at 9 1/2 o'clock, at the College, No. 67 Crosby st.

FIRE.—About 6 o'clock yesterday
 morning, a fire broke out in the lower part of a build-
 ing in Delancy st. near Orchard, occupied as a cabinet-
 maker's shop. It was soon extinguished. Damage
 slight.

Last evening, at 6 o'clock, a fire broke out
 in the premises No. 5 West Broadway. The firemen
 were early on the ground, and soon succeeded in
 subduing the flames. Damage trifling.

About eight o'clock, last evening, a fire
 was discovered in the lower story of the building, No.
 333 Pearl st., occupied by Messrs. Hooper & Sons, look-
 ing-glass frame manufacturers. The firemen were early
 on the ground, and, as was supposed, had extinguished
 the fire, but, to their great surprise, in a few minutes
 thereafter the flames burst out from the second story,
 with great violence. In consequence of the great
 quantity of combustible matter in the upper part of the
 building, the fire spread with great rapidity, and in a
 short time the third and fourth stories were in flames.
 The firemen labored with great perseverance, but de-
 spite their exertions the whole interior of the building
 was nearly gutted, only the store and part of the second
 story being saved. The building is owned by Harper
 & Brothers, and is fully insured. The loss will prob-
 ably amount to about \$50,000.

Messrs. Hooper & Sons had just got in a large stock
 of material necessary to their business, and their loss
 will be pretty heavy. Neither of the firm being present,
 the reporter could not ascertain their loss, or whether
 they are insured.

The adjoining buildings, on the one side occupied by
 the Messrs. Harper, and on the other as a large board-
 ing house, were considerably injured by water, and it
 was only through the greatest exertion on the part
 of the firemen that they were prevented from taking fire.

The police in large numbers were on the ground and
 rendered material assistance to the firemen.

The building destroyed was once occupied by Dr. Wm
 Chilton, at the time he was Mayor of this City.

FIRE.—About 3 o'clock yesterday morn-
 ing, a fire occurred in a building in East Twenty-eighth
 st., near Broadway. The flames were soon subdued by
 the prompt arrival of the firemen. Damage trifling.

SHAMEFUL ROBBERY AT THE SHIRT-
SEWERS' UNION.—Some callous and pitiless burglars
 entered the store of the Shirt-Sewers' Union, No. 70
 Bleecker st., on Monday morning last, and abstracted
 from the shelves some \$300 worth of the stock, made
 up by the poor seamstresses, most of which were the
 choicest order shirts, on the eve of being sent out to
 the patrons of the Union. Had the vagabonds who per-
 petrated this crime been possessed of one redeeming
 trait, they would have spared the poor shirt women
 who are almost stricken down by this unexpected re-
 verse in their fortune. The Union, by the aid of kind
 friends, had struggled up to independence, and since
 the first of May last their business had been steadily
 gaining, with every assurance of establishing a per-
 manent organization as a precedent for the exodus of the
 oppressed needle women of our City, by associating
 together and thereby securing the fruits of their ardu-
 ous and too ill-rewarded toil, without appropriating the

lion share to heartless employers. The Union feel very
 much disheartened by their loss, and the more so, as
 they will be compelled to discontinue their work, going
 to the country. The Police are in possession of the
 marks on the shirts, and may succeed in bringing the
 offenders to justice.

REAL ESTATE.—The following sales of

Real Estate made by Cole & Chilton, July 1:
 1 lot north side 46th st., near 8th av., \$250
 2 lots north side 46th st., adjoining, \$500
 1 lot, near N. 87th st., near 5th av., 595
 1 lot, near N. 87th st., near 5th av., 595
 House and lot on South 24th st., near 9th av., 1,075
 1 lot, 2x77, on South 1st, corner of 9th st., 570
 3 lots, 2x77, adjoining, near, Laramie and Union av., 800
 2 lots on the west side of 1st av., near N. 87th st., 230
 1 lot on 87th st., near N. 1st and N. 2d, \$750
 1 lot on 87th st., near N. 1st and N. 2d, \$750
 1 lot on 87th st., near N. 1st and N. 2d, \$750

THE GOVERNMENT FRAUD CASE.—The

examination relative to this matter was resumed yester-
 day afternoon, before Justice Stuart. An opening of
 Court motion was made to investigate the charges
 against Wm H. Merrin and Wm. Merrin, two of the
 accused, which was carried.

John B. Brahm, of No. 271 Pearl st., Brooklyn, was
 called as a witness, to prove the handwriting of the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

Several witnesses were then called by the plaintiff
 or one of his attorneys, in which the plaintiff's alleged
 fraud was proved, and a warrant was drawn, and whose
 names appeared in the papers, resided in Hagerst, (where
 it was alleged in the warrant that Phelps Hoffman did
 reside at the time the warrant was drawn, and was then
 in the hands of the plaintiff, and was then sworn
 and testified to being acquainted with the handwriting of
 the defendant, Merrin, whom he had known for 10
 years, and that the belief of certain papers pertaining to
 the case were, in his belief, in the handwriting of Mer-
 rin.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

The testimony for the prosecution here closed for the
 present, several witnesses not being in attendance, and
 Thos. W. Smith, Esq., read the indictment against the de-
 fendant, which was read by the witness, and was that
 of the handwriting of the paper (a land warrant produced)
 in his handwriting; he could not, however, swear positively
 that it was.

CHARGE OF ROBBERY.—A man named
 Eugene Harris was yesterday arrested, charged with
 robbing a young man named Geo. De Wolfe of about
 \$130. The complainant had been sent by his employer,
 in the country, to this City to make a certain payment,
 but on arriving here soon fell in with the accused, whom
 he alleges robbed him of every cent. The accused was
 committed by Justice Bogart, for examination.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT.—On Be-
 fore Judge Nelson and Beets—*Decisions.*—*Benj.*
Talbot, Jr., and others, vs. The Trustees of the City of New York.
and Daniel Smith.—The Court considered the petition
 of the plaintiffs, to set aside the verdict in the case of
 the jury, on the trial of the case, and a new and useful
 result in the manufacture of lead pipe was produced by
 means of the different construction of defendant's ma-
 chine, was not sufficiently explicit or guarded in the de-
 cision as to what constitutes a new and useful result.
 Verdict for defendants set aside, and a new trial ordered.
Verdict for defendants set aside, and a new trial ordered.
Verdict for defendants set aside, and a new trial ordered.
Verdict for defendants set aside, and a new trial ordered.

NOTICE.—The undersigned having been
 appointed receiver of the property and effects of the late firm
 of Messrs. H. & C. Co. of the City of New York, requests
 all persons indebted to said firm to make immediate pay-
 ment to him, or to the undersigned, at his office, at No. 112
 Broadway, New York, on or before the 1st of August, 1852.
 Wm. W. Wain, Receiver.

BROOKLYN ITEMS.
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.—This body met
 at the County Jail on Wednesday, Ald. Morris presiding.
 The Committee on Almshouse reported in favor of
 awarding to Messrs. A. & C. Co. the contract for building
 a sewer on the County Farm. They agreed to do the
 work for \$270 per running foot—Adopted. Messrs.
 French & Dunham, being the lowest bidders, were
 awarded the contract for furnishing brick to build an
 addition to the Penitentiary. A resolution was adopted
 inquiring into the propriety and probable expense of
 sending so many of the inmates of this County as can-
 not be comfortably accommodated in the buildings of
 the County Farm to the Lunatic Asylum at Utica.
 The following resolutions relative to the Lunatic Asy-
 lum were offered by Ald. Spinoza:
 Resolved, That it be referred to the Committee on Lunatic
 Asylums to report at the next meeting of the Board the
 propriety of purchasing the "Lunatic Asylum," as sit-
 uated near the new Lunatic Asylum and other County pur-
 poses; also, a full statement of the quantity of land contained in
 said farm and the cost thereof.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.

Verdict for Evans vs. The Protection Insurance Co.—A
 verdict for \$1200 was given for plaintiff on a policy of
 insurance for \$1200. The Court considered the case was
 not properly brought before the jury. New trial granted.
 Pending to be returned.